



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,052	09/12/2003	Berna Erol	015358-009420US	6732
20350 7590 12/19/2006 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER MYINT, DENNIS Y	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/19/2006	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/661,052	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EROL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dennis Myint	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on 27 September 2006.
2. Claims 1-83 in this application: Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52, 61, 69, and 78 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on 27 September 2006, claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52, 61, 69, and 78 were amended. This office action is made final.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 27 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### ***(i) Response to Applicant's arguments regarding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Based on the amendments, Applicant argued that *Applicants' claim 1 compares recorded information (recorded during a presentation) to a separate source document that contains information corresponding to the source information that was presented during the presentation. If a portion of the separate source document corresponds with a portion of the recorded information, such as the document including in image corresponding to a slide shown during the presentation and included in the separated recorded information, then a criteria is satisfied and an action taken... Lin does not teach such functionality* (Applicant's argument, Page 18) *Lin does not disclose*

Art Unit: 2162

*comparing the recorded information to a separate source document (Applicants' argument, Page 19) Lin does not disclose comparing the bitstreams... (Applicants' argument, Page 19) Lin does not teach or suggest comparing a separate source document to recorded information... (Applicants' argument, Page 20).*

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *compares recorded information (recorded during a presentation) to a separate source document that contains information corresponding to the source information that was presented during the presentation. If a portion of the separate source document corresponds with a portion of the recorded information, such as the document including in image corresponding to a slide shown during the presentation and included in the separated recorded information, then a criteria is satisfied and an action taken... Lin does not disclose comparing the recorded information to a separate source document... Lin does not disclose comparing the bitstreams... Lin does not teach or suggest comparing a separate source document to recorded information...*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***(i) Response to Applicant's arguments regarding rejection under 35 U.S.C.***

**§ 103**

Referring to claims 6, 17, 22-29, 36 and 73, Applicant argued that *Boegelund* does not, however, teach or suggest comparing a separate source document to recorded information to determine whether there are corresponding portions, and they displaying a translated slide on a device in response thereto (Applicant' argument, Lines 10-14 of Page 20) and that *Smith* does not, however, teach or suggest comparing a separate source document to recorded information to determine whether there are corresponding portions (Applicant' argument, Page 20 Line 27 to Page 21 Line 2).

In response, Applicant is pointed that that the limitation, "***comparing*** a separate source document to recorded in formation to determine whether there are corresponding portion" is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Please refer to the response to Applicant's arguments regarding rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1-5, 7-16, 18-21, 31-72, and 74-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205477).

As per claim 1, Lin is directed to “a method and system for performing an action” (Lin, Paragraph 0028, i.e., *When the plurality of bitstreams 15A are **replayed** by using a computer controllable display screen and an audio play back device*) and teaches the limitations:

“accessing recorded information” (“multimedia object”) (Lin, Paragraph 0027-0028, i.e. “When the plurality of bitstreams 15 are **replayed**...”, and Figure 1A: *multimedia object unit 15A*) “the recorded information including information recorded during an presentation of source information” (Lin, Paragraph 0026, i.e., *Multimedia Data Object*; Paragraph 0027, i.e., *The multimedia data object unit 15 functions to generate a multimedia data object including a plurality of synchronized overlaid replayable bitstreams 15A (FIG. 1) representing the real-time slide representation captured by image capture device 13 and audio signal capture device 14*);

"determining a source document using the recorded information" (Lin, Paragraph 0025, i.e., *As a result, the unit 15 can locate the point of interest within the image signal 11A of the **corresponding** slide being displayed and insert a **digital symbol** representation the presenter interaction with the point of interest during real-time slide presentation. For instance, the presenter 10A can physically point at a point of interest 10B within the display area 10 (FIG. 1B) residing between the line of sight of the image capture device and the displayed slides at that point (FIG. 1C) will be displayed within the slide at that point (FIG. 1C). This predetermined symbol will be referred to herein as a symbolic representation of the presenter interaction;* Paragraph 0028, i.e. *When the plurality of bitstreams 15A are replayed, by using a computer controllable display screen and an audio playback device (i.e., audio speaker), the display are displays the image of each slide according to the first bitstream having synchronously overlaid upon it **the symbolic representation** of the presenter's interactions corresponding to the second bitstream while the audio device synchronously replays the third audio bitstream), "the source information being separate from the recorded information and including information at least a portion of the source information" (Line, Paragraphs 0026-0030, i.e., *Multimedia Data Object*; **Figure 4**; and Paragraph 0061 and FIG. 10, Note that in the system and method of Lin, it is inherent that Multimedia Data Objects are recorded and saved separate from source documents; Said multimedia data objects records real-*

time presentations. Therefore, at least a portion of the source information is included.

Refer to Figures 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2, and 3)

“determining if a criterion is satisfied based on the recorded information and the source document, the criterion being satisfied if a portion of the source document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information “(Lin, Paragraph 0037, i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function*);

“determining an action to be performed if the criterion is satisfied” (Lin, Paragraph 0028-0030 and Paragraphs 0038-0042); and

“performing the action if it is determined that the criterion is satisfied” (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. “when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....” and Paragraphs 0039-0046, i.e., *mapping function*).

As per claim 2, Lin teaches the limitation:

“ wherein the information in the recorded information comprises an image of information outputted from the source document” (Lin, Paragraph 0027, i.e. “image data” and Figure 2 “Image Data” ).

As per claim 3, Lin teaches the limitation:



Art Unit: 2162

" wherein determining the source document comprises comparing an image in the source document with the image of information outputted from the source document to determine if the image in the source document matches the image of information outputted from the source document" (Lin, Paragraph 0028, i.e. "For example, Fig. 1D shows a replayed slide *corresponding* to the captured image of the real-time slide presentation"; and Paragraph 0037, .i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function* ).

As per claim 4, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein the information from the source document comprises an image" (Lin, Paragraph 0027, "image data", Paragraph 0028, "image data", and Paragraph 0033 "image signal").

As per claim 5, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein performing the action comprises performing the action using the image" (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, "image data" ).

As per claim 7, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining if the criterion is satisfied comprises:

Art Unit: 2162

associating information from the recorded information with the information in the source document" (Lin, Paragraph 0037, i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function*); and

"associating the information in the source document with information for the criterion" (Lin, Paragraph 0037, i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function*);).

As per claim 8, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein information for the criterion and action associated with the criterion is associated with the source document" (Lin Paragraph 0025, 0028, 0029, 0031 and 0033; and Lin, Paragraph 0037, i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function*).

As per claim 9, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein the information associated with the source document is embedded in the source document" (Lin, Paragraph 0025).

As per claim 10, Lin teaches the limitation:

"wherein the recorded information comprises information identifying the information in the source document that has been outputted" (Lin, Paragraph 0025, 0027, 0033 and 0035).

As per claim 11, Lin is teaches the limitation:

"wherein the recorded information comprises an identifier, wherein the identifier is used to determine the information in the source document "(Lin Paragraph 0025-0028).

Claim 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1, 2, 4, 7, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Claim 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 224, 27, 28, 29, and 30 respectively.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 6, 17, 22-29, 36, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Boegelund et al. (hereinafter, "Boegelund") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0101043).

Referring to claim 6, Lin teaches the method of claim 4 but does not explicitly disclose that images are translated from one language to another language. However, Boegelund et al. teaches a method and system for translating slide presentations into different languages, wherein texts in presentation slides are translated from one

Art Unit: 2162

language to another and displayed (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "the text is then translated to the new language." and Paragraph 0047).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to combine the method and system for translating presentation slides from one language to another as taught by Boegelund et al. with the system and method of Lin so that the combined method and system would constitute the method of claim 4, wherein performing the action comprises communicating a translated image of the image to a device (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and 0047 and Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device....."). One would have been motivated to do so in order to "have a method that can translate presentation slide information from one language to a second language in an efficient and accurate and cost-effective manner" (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0014).

Claim 17 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Referring to claim 22, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 6 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed to a method for determining translated slides (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "the text is then translated to the new language.") of source document slides in a source document, the method comprising:

"accessing recorded information, the recorded information including information recorded during a presentation of source information from at least on source document" ("multimedia object") (Lin, Paragraph 0027-0028, i.e. "When the plurality of bitstreams 15 are replayed..."; Figure 1A "multimedia object unit" 15A; and Paragraph 0026, i.e., *Multimedia Data Object*; Paragraph 0027, i.e., *The multimedia data object unit 15 functions to generate a multimedia data object including a plurality of synchronized overlaid-replayable bitstreams 15A (FIG. 1) representing the real-time slide representation **captured** by image capture device 13 and audio signal capture device 14*);

"determining a source document slide in at least one source document that corresponds to a portion of the recorded information" (Lin, Paragraph 0037, i.e., .. *and includes a means for deriving at least one mapping function between the display area as defined by the slide image data and the captured display area as defined by the captured image data*; and also note Paragraphs 0038-0040, i.e., *mapping function*);

"determining a translated slide of the source document slide" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "the text is then translated to the new language." and Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. "Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams..." ); and

"communicating the translated slide to a device, whereby the device is operable to display the translated slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information" (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....").

Referring to claim 23, Lin in view of Boegelund as applied above with regard to claim 6 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 22 and teaches the limitation:

“ wherein determining the translated slide comprises translating text of the source document slide to generate the translated slide” (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. “the text is then translated to the new language.” and Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. “Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams...”).

Referring to claim 24, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 6 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 22 and teaches the limitation:

“ wherein determining the translated slide comprises:  
determining a storage location of the translated slide (Boegelund. Paragraph 0048, i.e. “ storage and retrieval”); and  
retrieving the translated slide from the storage location” (Boegelund et al. Paragraph 0048, i.e. “ storage and retrieval”).

Referring to claim 25, Lin in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises causing the translated slide to be displayed on the device” (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. “when

Art Unit: 2162

the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....”).

Referring to claim 26, Lin in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises storing the translated slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. “when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....”).

Referring to claim 27, Lin in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein the recorded information comprises an image of an outputted source document slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0025, 0027, 0033 and 0035).

Referring to claim 28, Lin in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining the source document slide comprises comparing the image of the outputted source document slide to information in the source document slide to determine if the image of the outputted source document matches the information in the source document slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0028, i.e. “For example, Fig. 1D shows a replayed slide *corresponding* to the captured image of the real-time slide presentation”).

Referring to claim 29, Lin in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:



"wherein the recorded information comprises information indicating that the source document slide in the source document has been outputted" (Lin, Paragraph 0025-0028 and 0033-0036).

Claim 36 and 73 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

8. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Boegelund et al. and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205601).

Referring to claim 30, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied to claim 27 above does not explicitly teach the limitation: "wherein the recorded information comprises a slide number, wherein the slide number is used to determine the source document slide".

However, Smith teaches the limitation:

"wherein the recorded information comprises a slide number, wherein the slide number is used to determine the source document slide" (Smith Paragraph 0073). Smith teaches a method and system for identifying, classifying, extracting and resolving hidden data in slides, wherein slide numbers are used to determine slides in a source document (Smith Paragraph 0073).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of employing slide number to identify/determine slides in a source document as taught by Smith to the method and

Art Unit: 2162

system of Lin in view of Boegelund et al. so that, in the resultant method and system, the recorded information would comprise a slide number, wherein the slide number is used to determine the source document slide. One would have been motivated to do so simply because slide numbers are used in the art to identify slides and that has been a well-known method in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


**Contact Information**

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint  
Examiner  
AU-2162

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100